

II. RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

A. Status of the Claims

Claims 46 and 48-98 were pending at the time of the Action. Claims 46, 48-56, 67-72, 75-79, and 82-98 stand rejected, and claims 57-66, 73-74, and 80-81 are objected to. Claims 80 and 98 have been canceled, claims 46, 53-56, 78-79, 81, 86-87, 90-91, and 96-97 have been amended in the Amendment contained herein, and claims 99-148 have been added. No new matter is added by the Amendment and new claims, and support for the Amendment and new claims can be found in the specification and claims as originally filed. Therefore, claims 46, 48-79, and 81-97, and 99-148 are pending after entry of the Amendment.

B. Examiner Interview Summary

On September 27, 2005, Applicants' representative Mark Wilson phoned Examiner Elhilo. Applicants and Examiner Elhilo discussed the final Official Action dated August 2, 2005 and potential strategies for obtaining allowance of the claims. Examiner Elhilo noted that claims 57-66, 73-74, and 80-81 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Examiner Elhilo indicated that if Applicants import the limitations from claims 57-66, 73-74, and/or 80-81 into the independent claims, he would consider such amendments. Further, Examiner Elhilo indicated that he would allow the claims if such amendments place the claims in condition for allowance. As detailed below, Applicants have amended the claims, in part, to incorporate several of Examiner Elhilo's suggestions. Applicants again wish to thank Examiner Elhilo for his time and attention to this file so that its prosecution can advance to issuance.

C. The Obviousness Rejection is Overcome

1. Claims 46, 48-56, 67-72, 75-79, and 82-97 are not Obvious Over Laurent in View of Lim and Further in View of Hocquaux

Claims 46, 48-56, 67-72, 75-79, and 82-97 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laurent et al. (US 2002/0046431) ("Laurent") in view of Lim et al. (US

6,461,391) (“Lim”) and further in view of Hocquaux et al. (US 5,543,436) (“Hocquaux”). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Applicants note that all of the rejected independent claims (46 and 96-97) have been amended herein, in part, to incorporate the limitation from claim 80. Applicants note that the Action states that the prior art of record (including Laurent, Lim, and Hocquaux) does not teach or disclose the claimed limitation of claim 80. The Action, p. 5. Applicants concur that the limitation of claim 80 is not taught or disclosed by the prior art. For at least this reason, the obviousness rejection of claims 46, 48-56, 67-72, 75-79, and 82-97 is improper and should be withdrawn, as a *prima facie* case of obviousness does not exist when the prior art references fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claims. *See In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974); MPEP § 2143.03.

D. Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present document is a full and complete response to the Office Action dated August 2, 2005. The present case is in condition for allowance, and such favorable action is respectfully requested.